

REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's thorough review of the application and the indication of allowable subject matter.

Replacement formal drawings have been ordered and will be submitted as soon as they are received.

With regard to the objections to the Specification, kindly note Page 3 of the Preliminary Amendment filed on May 19, 2006, in which Applicant inserted appropriate section headings and changed the "fig. 2" on Page 10 to "fig. 3." Applicant believes that these amendments were sufficient to overcome the objections to the Specification.

Claim 6 has been amended to depend from Claim 1, which should overcome the objection to that claim.

Claims 1, 6, 7, and 8 have been amended for clarity and to correct informalities to overcome the 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejections on Page 3 of the Office Action.

Claims 2 - 7 have also been amended to change "characterised in that" to "wherein" in accordance with U.S. practice.

New Claim 9 incorporates features canceled from Claim 7.

Claim 5 has been rewritten in independent form incorporating the features of canceled Claim 1 and the remaining claims have been amended to depend from Claim 5. Claim 1 has been canceled without prejudice and without disclaimer.

No new matter has been added by the amendments. No new issues are raised by the amendments.

As Claim 5 has been indicated to be allowable, and as the formal rejections have been overcome, the application should be in condition for allowance. Should the next action be

anything other than a Notice of Allowance, in the interest of expedited prosecution and disposal, Applicant respectfully requests the favor of a telephone call to the undersigned.

In the Allowable Subject Matter section, the Examiner has set forth reasons for the allowability of certain claims. Applicant respectfully traverses these reasons. Specifically, it is submitted that the subject matter of the allowed claims is patentable for their respective recitations of claimed combinations as a whole. That is, patentability of the claims rests on the combination of recited elements and limitations. As such, Applicant submits that no one element or limitation in particular should be deemed to impart or be required for patentability of the claims. Furthermore, Applicant also submits that the dependent claims are allowable not only for their dependence on the allowed claims, but also for the additional subject matter recited in each of those dependent claims.

Claims 1 - 8 are patentable over Mimata et al. (US 7,176,392) in view of Dillon et al. (US 3,679,846), Yamasaki (US 6,713,692), Cheng (US 6,809,275), and Nakamura et al (US 6,246,019).

Although Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's rejections, in the interest of expedited prosecution Applicant has canceled Claim 1 without disclaimer and without prejudice, rewritten allowable Claim 5 in independent form, and amended the remaining claims to depend from allowable Claim 5. As a result, the prior art rejections are moot.

CONCLUSION

Reconsideration and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully,



James C. Wray, Reg. No. 22,693
Clifford D. Hyra, Reg. No. 60,086
1493 Chain Bridge Road, Suite 300
McLean, Virginia 22101
Tel: (703) 442-4800
Fax: (703) 448-7397

Date: February 19, 2008